



U.S. Department of Justice

United States Attorney  
Southern District of New York

The Silvio J. Mollo Building  
One Saint Andrew's Plaza  
New York, New York 10007

February 12, 2016

**BY ECF**

The Honorable Alison J. Nathan  
United States District Judge  
United States District Court  
40 Foley Square, Room 2102  
New York, NY 10007

**Re: United States v. Royce Corley  
13 Cr. 48 (AJN)**

Dear Judge Nathan:

On January 15, 2016, the Court ruled on numerous motions made by *pro se* defendant Royce Corley principally concerning his effort to enlarge the record before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit by supplementing it with material Corley does not possess and which was not admitted at trial in the District Court (docket no. 101) (the "January 15 Order"). On February 4, 2015, the District Court filed two letters submitted by Corley (docket nos. 105 and 106) concerning the January 15 Order, which the Government now responds to by this letter.

By letter dated January 26, 2016 (docket no. 105), Corley lodges two objections to the January 15 Order and makes three requests (numbered 3, 4, and 5). Each is addressed in turn.

Objection 1: Corley objects to the Court's ruling in the January 15 Order denying his motion to obtain the real names of his three underage victims for the purpose of conducting an out-of-court investigation into the victims' respective ages at the time of the charged crime. Assuming for purposes of this letter that Corley's objection is a motion for reconsideration by the Court of the January 15 Order, the Government opposes Corley's motion on the bases already outlined by the Court in its Order. Particularly relevant to Corley's objection is the Court's finding that "Corley will not be prejudiced by any inability to perform further investigations, because he will not be permitted to supplement the record with what he finds." January 15 Order, at 7 (citing *Miro v. Plumbers & Pipefitters Nat'l Pension Fund*, No. 01-cv-5196, 2002 WL 31357702, at \*2 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 17, 2002) ("[I]t is well-settled that the purpose of Rule 10(e) is not to allow a district court to add to the record on appeal matters that did not occur there in the course of proceedings leading to the judgment under review.") (internal quotation marks omitted)).



Hon. Alison J. Nathan, U.S.D.J.  
February 12, 2016

Page 3

cc: Royce Corley (by Fedex)  
Inmate No. 68011-054  
FCI Danbury  
Route 37  
Danbury, CT 06811